Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

United States
Department of
Agriculture

NATIONAL
AGRICULTURAL
LIBRARY

Advancing Access to
Global Information for
Agriculture

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Radio Service

OFFICE OF INFORMATION

UNCLE SAM AT YOUR SERVICE

Monday, October 7, 1935

(FOR BROADCAST USE ONLY)

Reading Time: 10 minutes

ANNOUNCEMENT: Station _____ now brings you the regular weekly report from the Food and Drug Administration of the United States Department of Agriculture.

---ooOoo---

Friends, no doubt you've heard of the "meanest man," the ornery crittur who would take candy from a baby, or push little chickens in the creek.

But have you ever heard of anybody mean enough to fill cans with water and a few grains of corn, and sell them to down-and-outers, and those on relief, as canned corn?

Here's the story of this economic fraud, from your official correspondent with the Food and Drug Administration:

"The St. Louis Station reports an economic fraud perpetrated mostly among consumers of the lowest income. A can of field corn brought to the Station was found to contain mostly water, with hardly enough corn to warrant calling the product corn soup. It is put up in No. 2 cans and retails at five cents. The purchasers are largely poor people, many of them on relief. After a can is opened, of course there's nothing the consumer can do about it. He has spent his nickel for water, flavored with corn. Inspectors investigated, and found that almost 500 cases of the so-called canned corn had been shipped into St. Louis by truck. Several brokers and wholesalers have handled the lot, each one disposing of part of it, but complaints from consumers and retailers forced them to take back the unsold cans. The inspectors have located a good many cases of the canned corn which were returned by small retailers to the wholesaler, after passing through at least four hands. Interstate shipment could not be established, and the city of St. Louis, therefore, destroyed the lot."

And that item, friends, is the first in our weekly sheaf of news notes from the Food and Drug Administration.

Referring again to your official report: "There is no let-up in Food and Drug law enforcement. As soon as one illegal practice is stamped out, there's another one calling for attention. The salmon packers, who made such an excellent record last season, when not a single consignment of salmon was seized, shipped nineteen lots of salmon in August which were found definitely objectionable because of decomposition. The lots were seized. Of course," comments your reporter, "these lots represent only a minute percentage of the annual American salmon pack of seven million shipping cases. Alaska cans 90 percent of the pack which enters the United States through the ports of Seattle and San Francisco. At these ports the salmon is closely supervised, and any bad fish is promptly confiscated."

Well, since the salmon packers had such a really remarkable record last season, we should be willing to forget about the mere nineteen lots of salmon which were seized in August. After all, this salmon was seized before it ever reached the market.

So to the next news item. Food and Drug Inspectors were kept pretty busy during the late summer, when big shipments of fruits and vegetables were moving in interstate commerce. It was the job of Food and Drug inspectors to prevent the interstate distribution of any produce that was infested with insects, and produce that carried excessive poison-spray residues. During August, Federal officials seized 18,700 quarts of insect infested blueberries and huckleberries. Two lots of frozen green peas, found to be infested with weevils, were likewise confiscated.

The next item concerns the campaign for clean crab-meat, still being waged by members of the industry and federal officials. This campaign is having its good effects. In August, the crabmeat reported for seizure had decreased one-third. The clean-butter-and-cream campaign is also having good results. During August, says your reporter, only 16,700 pounds of unclean butter were seized, and only 380 gallons of cream.

Included in today's report is a list of foods seized during August on account of decomposition, filth, and infestation present at the time of shipment in interstate commerce. However, I won't read the entire list. These products, like the salmon, have been removed from the market and there's no danger of your buying them. However, for those interested in the type of articles seized, I'll read a few: 209 crates of eggs, 4 barrels of dressed poultry, 24 shipments of tomato sauce, paste, puree and catsup. One lot of domestic tomato paste was seized because the label gave the impression that the tomato paste was of foreign (Italian) origin. Two lots of so-called olive oil, which were in fact predominantly cottonseed oil, were confiscated because of adulteration and also because they were represented as a foreign product.

Then there were substandard canned peaches, tomatoes and peas. Concerning these products, your correspondent states: "Such articles, when in wholesome condition and not in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, may be sold legally if labeled to show their true character. However, their sale without such notification works an economic fraud upon the consumer, who is unable to critically examine the food until he has bought it."

Well, that's something like the economic fraud we were talking about a few mintues ago, the canned corn which was mostly water.

The Food and Drug Administration also reports the seizure during August of shipments of 13 patent medicines, seized because the labels made claims the medicines could not fulfil. Whether these medicines were like the powerful "Pocohontas" remedy that enabled a certain steamboat to win a race, I do not know. Anyway, the Food and Drug Administration had no "Claremore Queen" to try them on.

And now, the last news item, from the Philadelphia Station of the Eff and Dee A, which reports another case of blindness from that dangerous fat-reducing drug we've mentioned before -- dinitrophenol (dye-nye-tro-phee-nol). In March,

1934, a lady in Detroit, Michigan, began to take dinitrophenol at the rate of five tablets a day. By the time she arrived for a visit in Camden, New Jersey, in the spring of 1935, she had taken off 80 pounds. While she was in Camden she continued to use the fat-reducing drug in small, irregular doses. In June her eyes began to give her trouble. She was examined by a Camden physician who told her that cataracts were forming in both eyes. In spite of treatment, within six weeks from the time of the diagnosis, cataracts had developed to such an extent that the woman was practically blind.

Now here are some interesting comments, which point to the fact that dinitrophenol alone was responsible for the cataracts. Quoting your report: "Nothing in the history of this case indicates that malnutrition or organic disorders were in any way responsible for the formation of the cataracts, for the woman had been exceptionally healthy up to the time when the eye trouble began."

And listen to this statement, my friends: "During the investigation, it developed that the woman was fully aware of the dangerous nature of the drug she was using." Well, it doesn't seem possible that anybody would use dinitrophenol, knowing how dangerous it is -- without the advice of a physician.

And, by the way, if you want a list of some of the names under which fat-reducing preparations containing dinitrophenol have been or are now being sold, write to the Food and Drug Administration, Washington, D. C. Ask for information on weight-reducers containing dinitrophenol, spelled d-i-n-i-t-r-o-p-h-e-n-o-l.

No more news items today. Next Monday at this time you'll have another report from your correspondent in Washington, D. C.

--ooOoo--

ANNOUNCEMENT: You have just heard a regular weekly talk, "Uncle Sam at Your Service," presented by Station _____ in cooperation with the Food and Drug Administration, U.S.D.A.

#####

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Radio Service

OFFICE OF INFORMATION

1.9

UNCLE SAM AT YOUR SERVICE Monday, October 14, 1935

(FOR BROADCAST USE ONLY)

Reading Time: 10 minutes

ANNOUNCEMENT: Station _____ now brings you the regular weekly report from the Food and Drug Administration of the United States Department of Agriculture.

--ooOoo--

Today, friends, your correspondent with the Food and Drug Administration pays tribute to the good old tomato, the vegetable that ranks first in the United States as a vegetable canning crop.

Quoting your official report: "When the tomato first came to the United States, around 1800, it was grown mainly as an ornamental plant. It was known as the 'love apple,' and nobody dared to eat it. You see in early days the 'love apple' was considered poison, because it is related to the nightshade plant. We might have gone on for hundreds of years without ever eating tomatoes, if one man, a painter of naval battles in the war of 1812, hadn't decided to take his life in his hands -- and eat a tomato! His friends warned him. They probably told him that he would die a miserable death, but the brave man went forth courageously, bit into a tomato -- and lived. I've heard that in Newport, Rhode Island, there's a monument dedicated to Michele Felice Corne, the first man in this country who ever ate a tomato.

"Nowadays the value of our annual tomato crop is estimated at nearly 40 million dollars," according to your official correspondent. "Canners and manufacturers spend about 22 million dollars of that sum, buying tomatoes for canning, for soups, purees, catsups, and tomato juice.

"If you like really big statistics," I'm still quoting, "I can tell you how many tons of tomatoes are grown every year, for commercial purposes. (This doesn't include the ones you raise in your own backyard garden.) For commercial purposes alone, we grow from 1,400,000 tons of tomatoes to 1,800,000 tons.

"Now, just keep that figure in mind -- over a million tons -- and you won't even be mildly surprised when I tell you that the Food and Drug Administration has to do a lot of inspecting to see that only good wholesome canned tomatoes, tomato soups and purees and catsups and tomato juice, are shipped in interstate commerce.

"Sometimes the weather makes extra work for Food and Drug inspectors. Earlier in the summer, for instance, the New Orleans Station reported that heavy rains had come just at ripening time, and caused a great number of rotten, moldy, or cracked tomatoes. Now, suppose you combine a poor quality of tomatoes with a manufacturer who is careless about sorting, and careless about washing and

canning. What do you get? You needn't look in the back of the book for the answer. Such a combination means tomato products full of peelings, trimmings, green tomatoes, and over-ripe ones too soft or too old to be easily peeled. It means that the catsup for your baked beans and codfish cakes may -- perish the thought! -- be made in part from rotten tomatoes.

"With a million tons of tomatoes going into cans and bottles every year," says your official reporter, "it's easy to understand why Food and Drug officials must be ever on the job, training chemists how to detect mold in tomato paste; inspecting and sampling, and -- wherever they find products that are not fit for us to eat -- making seizures. For example, the Chicago Station, in July, reported 54 seizures of tomato products, valued at $69,000.

"Of course, reliable canners and manufacturers put up only topnotch products. Their modern factories and kitchens contain only the best and most efficient equipment. Their standards of sanitation are very high. Naturally, the reliable members of the tomato canning industry -- like those in the dairy and salmon industries we mentioned last week -- are always interested in campaigns for clean wholesome foods. The Food and Drug Administration most heartily cooperates with these campaigns, for one of the Administration's duties is to keep unwholesome foods off the market.

"As you will recall from previous reports, the most important duty of the Food and Drug Administration is to protect public health; that's why they seize all shipments of foods that contain added poisons, or foods that are contaminated with disease-producing bacteria, and worthless medicines offered for serious diseases. Second in importance are violations involving the distribution of decomposed or filthy foods. Such products are not necessarily harmful to health, but they are wholly revolting. The Food and Drugs Act holds a product to be 'adulterated' if it consists wholly or in part of a 'filthy, decomposed, or putrid animal or vegetable substance.' Such products, when shipped in interstate commerce, are subject to seizure.

"Now it's pretty hard for an ordinary person to tell whether tomato paste, or catsup or puree, is contaminated with mold, or in other words made from partially decomposed tomatoes. A very small number of manufacturers -- the careless and unethical minority -- sometimes take advantage of this fact. Ethical manufacturers and the Food and Drug Administration work together to keep these undesirable products off the market. The Administration has devised a method of detecting and counting mold in tomato paste, and this method is used as an effective means of eliminating spoiled tomatoes from the factory by most manufacturers. But this up-to-date method of mold-counting has not yet reached all corners of the industry. Until it does, there will be occasional cases like that which came up recently when one of Uncle Sam's food examiners converted a Federal court into a school room, and enabled the Government to win a contested food seizure case. The cannery whose tomato catsup had been seized testified that the catsup did not contain an undue amount of mold. The Government's food examiner said that it did. Somebody's figures were wrong. To reach a decision, the Court ordered a brief adjournment. The microscopes of both sides were set up. Samples of the tomato catsup were tested right then and there.

"Mr. B. J. Howard, Chief of the microanalytical laboratory of the Food and Drug Administration, explained to the court, and also to the food examiner for the cannery, his method of counting molds on foods. He pointed out the mistakes in the cannery's method of examining tomato catsup for mold. The attorney for the cannery watched closely. Later, he consented to a decree of condemnation, as originally sought by the Government.

"Mr. Howard," explains your correspondent, "has taught a good many cannery employees the proper method of using the microscope in examining and counting molds on foods. During July and August, he held two very successful schools, one at Purdue University, where there was an attendance of 62. He was on his way to conduct a similar school at Ohio State University when he was called to attend the trial of the canning company which had contested the seizure action against their tomato catsup, 'adulterated,' according to the charge, 'because of excessive mold.'

"If the chemists involved in this trial had had the benefit of the training given at the universities," comments your correspondent, "probably the tomato catsup would never have been made."

And, now, friends, your correspondent explains how difficult it is to detect moldy tomato pulp just by looking at it. Some of the samples of catsup he saw in the Food and Drug laboratory contained 20 percent of moldy tomato material, but they looked all right to his untrained eyes, until the chemist in charge pointed out the little black specks of mold. Even then, your correspondent admits, he might have gone on thinking the black specks were nothing more than pepper, if he hadn't looked at a small amount of the catsup through a microscope. Then he saw the mold as it really is -- slender, thread-like filaments. These filaments grow through tomatoes and cause them to rot. Of course after these rotten, moldy tomatoes have been put through a screen, or a sieve, and then cooked and bottled, the untrained person cannot detect the mold. Incidentally, Mr. Howard's method of mold counting is the only method yet devised for catching this condition in tomato products.

And so concludes today's report from the Food and Drug Administration, a brief review of how the Government food inspectors and chemists work to assure you a good wholesome supply of canned tomato products. And remember, friends, that the great majority of manufacturers are jealous of their reputation and their product. They put up only the best tomatoes, picked at exactly the right stage or ripeness, and rushed from field to can before they have a chance to lose any of their freshness.

As we said before, the "love apple" now heads the list of all vegetable canning crops. If you want to know more about this excellent vegetable, just ask your home economist friends about its food value. They'll have you wondering which came first -- the tomato or the vitamins.

--ooOoo--

ANNOUNCEMENT: You have just heard a regular weekly talk, "Uncle Sam at Your Service," presented by Station _____ in cooperation with the Food and Drug Administration, U.S.D.A. Listen in again next Monday for another report of how Uncle Sam protects your food supply.

#####

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Radio Service

OFFICE OF INFORMATION

LIBRARY
RECEIVED
★ OCT 1, 1935 ★
U. S. Department of Agriculture

UNCLE SAM AT YOUR SERVICE Monday, October 21, 1935

(FOR BROADCAST USE ONLY)

Reading Time: 9 minutes

ANNOUNCEMENT: Station _____ now brings you the regular weekly report from the Food and Drug Administration, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

--ooOoo--

Friends, your official correspondent suggests that we make a brief tour of the country today. He says there's nothing like getting news first hand, from the various stations of the Food and Drug Administration. So -- on our way.

First stop -- Chicago. Let's inquire about the campaign for good tomato products. Well, this campaign seems to be coming along fine. A survey made recently in northern Indiana indicates that the tomato industry "is making a concerted effort to conform with the law." Of the twenty factories visited during the survey, the Chicago Station reports, only one was using tomatoes of a questionable character. Several tomato plants -- let's call them tomato factories -- have installed new sorting tables and better equipment than they had last season. They've also increased the number of employees in their factories and have engaged chemists to test each batch of tomato paste -- or puree or catsup -- before canning.

These chemists, by the way, are known as "mold counters." Most of them attended the school mentioned in your report last week, the canners' school at Purdue University conducted by Mr. B. J. Howard of the Food and Drug Administration. According to your report: "The mold-counters are earnestly endeavoring to keep tomato products well within the prescribed tolerance for mold." Now that's the sort of news we all like to hear.

From Chicago, let's go down to Georgia and see what the Atlanta Station of the Food and Drug Administration has to say about the campaign for clean butter and cream in Alabama, Florida, and Georgia. "Making progress," is the report. For that matter, says your correspondent, practically all the Food and Drug Stations have the same report concerning the nation-wide campaign for clean butter and cream -- "making progress."

Now let's call on the New York Station, down on Varick Street in New York City..... Here's a rather unusual bit of news. It doesn't pay citizens of foreign countries to violate the Food and Drugs Act of the United States, if they plan to become citizens of this country. One Socrates Moscahlades (Mahs-cah-lah-deez) was recently charged with obtaining citizenship under

circumstances involving fraud and illegality. In 1926, the New York Station reports, when his citizenship was granted to him, Mr. ----- Oh, let's just call him Mr. "M" -- testified that he had no criminal record. But it was discovered that Mr. M., who is a packer of edible oils, had been convicted of violating the Food and Drugs Act in 1919, 1920, and 1922. The Court found him guilty, cancelled his naturalization certificate, and he was "forever enjoined from claiming any rights and privileges of citizenship."

Now come on out to the Seattle Station, and let's ask about salmon..... Well, I'm almost sorry we asked. The Seattle Station reports the seizure of 24 consignments of canned salmon from Alaska. That's too bad, especially after the splendid record the salmon canning industry made last year.

While we're in Seattle, let's check up on the apple and spray residue situation... Here's promising news for homemakers. Every single lot of the new crop of apples now beginning to move in Central Washington, according to the Seattle authorities, will be subjected to sampling and analysis under State control. Any lots of apples which are not passable will be held under embargo until they are cleaned. There are ample laboratory facilities for handling all samples, and these laboratories are subject to general checking and supervision by the Seattle Station of the Food and Drug Administration..... It looks as if all the new crop of apples coming from Washington will be free from undue amounts of spray residue.

Your official correspondent, who is our guide on this trek around the country -- (I'm only his spokesman) -- suggests that we stop right here in Washington State and eat a few of these fine apples while he gives us two items of information. First, information for apple-growers. Do you know that the Department of Agriculture has just published a bulletin, entitled "Spray-Residue Removal from Apples and Other Fruits"? Those interested can get a copy by sending five cents to the Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D. C. This bulletin is a revision of an older bulletin on the same subject.

The next item of information is for homemakers who want to be sure that apples and pears are free from spray residue. Food and Drug officials state that fruit growers and handlers are almost unanimously placing on the market clean fruit this year, so you don't need to worry much about your fruit supply. But, if you want to make assurance of safety doubly sure, remember this advice given by the Secretary of Agriculture last year: "The usual sanitary practice in the home, of scrubbing such fruits as apples and pears with water, is desirable under any circumstances. Peeling the fruit, or perhaps better, removal of stem and blossom ends where the residue is most difficult to reach, is an added measure of safety which may be recommended."

But that's enough about spray residue. We must be on our way. Stick an apple in your pocket, and let's go down to the San Francisco Station to see what's new and interesting. We're bound to find something "unusual," in the good old California tradition.....

Yes, didn't I tell you so? The San Francisco Station reports that Japan is sending us a great variety of products, and that during August, Japan sent over a shipment of canned loquats, the "first ever recorded by the Frisco Station!"

Quoting the authorities: "The sample of loquats examined showed the product to have a very fine appearance, the fruit was of good size and quite firm, and was halved and packed in very light sirup. The taste was apparently characteristic and was not unpleasant, although entirely different from any canned domestic fruit."

We may as well go on down to Los Angeles now, and see what the Los Angeles Station has to report..... As you might expect, they're busy examining tomato products down here in Southern California. Food and Drug officials have had to make some seizures of tomato paste, but the Station reports that canners are working hard to clear up the situation.

And here's something we should know about -- the new law concerning tomato products passed by the State of California. This law, effective last month, September 14th, "prohibits the artificial coloring of canned tomatoes or tomato products of any variety or type of pack. A statement on the label to the effect that a product is artificially colored will not correct the adulteration. The new law also provides for 'solid pack' and sets for canned tomato products a minimum score of 85 points for all factors, [illegible] when scored according to the system defined by the United States standards for grades of tomatoes, as issued by the United States Department of Agriculture in 1933."

Next week, friends, your official reporter says we'll continue this visit around the country to various Stations of the Food and Drug Administration. So be ready to travel next Monday.

And perhaps I'd better remind you again about the Farmers' Bulletin, "Spray-Residue Removal from Apples and Other Fruits." The number is 1752. You can get a copy by sending five cents to the Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D. C.

--ooOoo--

CLOSING ANNOUNCEMENT: You have just heard the regular weekly broadcast, "Uncle Sam at Your Service," presented by Station _____ in cooperation with the Food and Drug Administration of the U. S. Department of Agriculture.

#####

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Radio Service

OFFICE OF INFORMATION

LIBRARY
RECEIVED

UNCLE SAM AT YOUR SERVICE Monday, October 28, 1935

(FOR BROADCAST USE ONLY)

Reading Time: 10 minutes

ANNOUNCEMENT: Station _____ now brings you the regular weekly report from the Food and Drug Administration, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

--ooOoo--

All aboard, friends! All aboard the F. & D.A. Special, bound for Washington, D. C., and any other points we want to visit today. Your official correspondent, by way of his regular weekly report, will serve as guide and master of ceremonies. I'm going to look after the baggage, and see that nobody gets lost among all those new government buildings in the Capital City.

First stop, Washington! Right this way, ladies and gentlemen, to the United States Department of Agriculture. . . across the street to the "South" Building. . . Wing Number One. . . take the elevator to the fourth floor. Here we are, in the offices of Uncle Sam's Food and Drug Administration. We've come to ask about that new ruling which concerns imitation preserves and jams. And here's your official correspondent, author of these weekly reports, ready to step right up and explain everything:

"This ruling," he tells us, "concerns the labeling of substandard jams and preserves. Some ten years ago," he explains, "the Food and Drug Administration issued an informal ruling that no regulatory action would be taken against mixtures of fruit and sugar, made from less than 45 but not more than 25 pounds of fruit to each 55 pounds of sugar, if these mixtures were labeled as compound pectin, sugar, and fruit preserve. Of course the percentages of all ingredients were to be given on the label. That informal ruling was issued in 1924.

"Nowadays these mixtures, formerly labeled as compounds, are almost universally labeled as imitations. Not because of Food and Drug regulations, but because under the National Recovery Act, during the operation of the code of fair competition for the preserve industry, such mixtures were considered imitations in accord with the standards of the preserve industry's code. As a result, consumers and members of the preserve industry have come to consider these products as imitations."

So states your correspondent. . . Homemakers, it looks as if from now on you're going to know for sure when you're buying imitation preserves and when you're buying the real thing, made with about the same proportions of fruit and sugar you'd use in your own kitchen. . . Continuing, in the words of your report:

"It is the opinion of the Solicitor of the United States Department of Agriculture that in view of their nature, these mixtures are imitation preserves or jams, and should be labeled with the word 'IMITATION' and in addition with a clear statement indicating wherein they are imitations."

And here's a sample lable, friends, for imitation preserves, which will meet with what your correspondent calls "the mandate of the law." Here's the sample label he sends you:

IMITATION STRAWBERRY PRESERVE
Prepared from 35 parts fruit to 55 parts
sugar with added pectin solution. Not concentrated.

If fruit acid or artificial color is added, the presence of these ingredients should be indicated in the explanatory statement. So just read the label, homemakers, and you'll know what's in the jam and preserves you buy.

Now, according to the itinerary in today's report from your Washington reporter, we're scheduled to leave Washington immediately and go on down to the New Orleans Station of the F. & D. A., to see how the shrimp packers are coming along with our winter supply of canned shrimp. (If this weren't a business trip, I'd suggest that we stay in New Orleans for lunch, and try some of the famous Creole cooking. How about a dish of Shrimp Creole?)

But here's your official correspondent, with imposing figures, as usual. (We ask for Shrimp Creole, and he gives us statistics!) Here they are:

"Of the 100,000 cases of shrimp packed in the New Orleans region during August, practically all have been packed under Federal inspection. The season had a somewhat late start because of a fisherman's strike, but this was settled about the middle of August, and all plants began packing to capacity. One plant is working 24 hours a day, canning so many shrimp that it takes three inspectors to keep up with the output."

Friends, do you remember a report sent you last June, concerning the Sea Food Amendment to the Food and Drugs Act? Inspection under this amendment is not compulsory, but a good many canneries are taking advantage of it.

Quoting Food and Drug officials in New Orleans: "The shrimp packers down here seem well pleased with the Federal inspection service. One packer wrote us a letter telling how the inspection service had helped him. Here are extracts from his letter: 'Can truthfully say things have been running smoothly with us and we are today packing the finest quality shrimp we have ever turned out. The fishermen are all taking better care of the shrimp and are learning how to take care of them on the fishing grounds. . .

"'Our ice boats today are using twice the amount of ice they used in previous seasons. . . . They are not trying to catch shrimp themselves, but taking them as fast as the catching boats draw in their nets, instead of permitting the shrimp to be piled on deck and left there for hours before icing. We feel that the shrimp industry is making rapid progress. . . Once all the fishermen know how to handle the shrimp on the fishing grounds, most of our troubles will be ended. . . . We are very enthusiastic over the future outlook of the shrimp industry.'"

Hmmm. . . . A few more enthusiastic reports like that one, and I'm going to desert this caravan. I'm going over to Canal Street and order a dish of Shrimp Gumbo, Creole Style. Want to come along?

No, I can see that you're interested in getting more facts about this Sea Food Amendment, and what it means to the homemaker, as well as to the shrimp industry. All right -- your official correspondent is now speaking:

"You may recall," he states in today's report, "that before this Amendment was passed -- that is, before June, 1934 -- many of the shrimp packers were facing financial ruin. A great proportion of their shrimp was not good enough to put on the market. Federal officers had to make seizure after seizure. The result of all these seizures was voluntary action, by the shrimp industry itself, culminating in the Sea Food Amendment to the Food and Drugs Act.

"According to this amendment, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, 'upon application of any packer of any sea food sold in interstate commerce, to designate supervisory inspectors to examine and inspect all premises, equipment, methods, materials, containers and labels used by such applicants in the production of such food.' This service is given at the cost of the packer. And if his product has been Government inspected, from the fishing boat to the processed can, the sea-food packer can put this statement on his label: Production Supervised by U. S. Food and Drug Administration."

Well, there's another item for label-reading homemakers to remember.

Now, one more statement from your official correspondent: "Last-minute reports show that the packing season began in August and that up to September 21, 1935, there were packed under inspection 356,165 cases of shrimp, as compared with 300,054 cases for all of last season, from September 1934 to June 1935."

So concludes today's report, and today's trip on the "F. & D. A. Special." Next Monday, says your correspondent, we'll stop in Philadelphia for a few minutes to learn about Pennsylvania's new "fresh egg" law.

--ooOoo--

CLOSING ANNOUNCEMENT: You have just heard the regular weekly broadcast, "Uncle Sam at Your Service," presented by Station _____ in cooperation with the Food and Drug Administration, U. S. Department of Agriculture. Listen in again next Monday for another report of how the Food and Drug Administration protects your food and drug supply.

#####

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Radio Service

OFFICE OF INFORMATION

UNCLE SAM AT YOUR SERVICE Monday, November 4, 1935.

(FOR BROADCAST USE ONLY)

Reading Time: 10 minutes.

ANNOUNCEMENT: Station _____ now brings you the regular weekly report from the Food and Drug Administration, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

----ooOoo----

Friends, you're going to travel again today. Not down to New Orleans, where you went last Monday to enjoy a dish of Shrimp Creole, and to learn about the shrimp industry. No, today's trip is something quite different, and, truth compels me to say -- not so pleasant.

For some months, you've been listening to weekly reports of the accomplishments of the Federal Food and Drug law. You've learned how it works, to protect your daily bread and butter, canned salmon and tuna fish and shrimp; poultry and eggs, apples and pears. You've learned how the law protects the family supply of drug products. Well, that's one side of the picture. . .

Now in order to do an honest and accurate job of reporting, your official correspondent with the Food and Drug Administration states that he must show you the other side of the picture -- the gloomy side -- the weaknesses and loopholes in the law, wherein it fails to protect the health of your family, and wherein it fails to protect your pocketbook. . .

Let's be on our way. The time is summer, 1932. The place is Baltimore, Maryland, the Federal Court, where we'll see a long line of medical experts, men of national and international reputation, who are testifying for the Government in a case against a fake tuberculosis remedy -- a fake remedy called "B&M." The jury's verdict, for the Government, is the culmination of legal actions begun against B&M more than ten years earlier.

Now let's find out about this B&M remedy, recommended for tuberculosis and other serious diseases. Originally, B&M was a horse liniment. It was made of ammonia, turpentine, water, and egg. But B&M graduated from the horse liniment class to the better-paying one of remedy for human tuberculosis, pneumonia, and a long list of other serious diseases.

On with the story. . . Back in 1922, a case was brought against B&M, alleging, in the language of the Food and Drugs Act, that its outlandish curative claims were "false and fraudulent." Now, under this wording of the law, it is necessary for the Government to prove not only that the manufacturer lied in his labels, but also that he knew he lied. That's the loophole your official correspondent is discussing in this report.

Well, physicians skilled in the treatment of tuberculosis testified that the labeling of B&M was false. But the manufacturer,-an old man -- an old man with the dignity of a patriarch, gave such convincing testimony of his faith in B&M that the jury believed him, and decided in his favor. That was in 1922. The Government lost the case. It had not proved that the old man knew he lied.

Through the ten years that followed, the Government collected evidence of the B&M manufacturer's "bad faith." Among a long list of victims who had been persuaded by the label to treat themselves with B&M -- and who died from the very same diseases B&M claimed to cure -- among these victims, were three sisters, Martha, Elizabeth, and Margaret Allen.

In 1924, they were admitted to the Rhode Island Tuberculosis Sanitorium. Margaret heard of B&M. She wasn't allowed to use this nostrum in the sanitorium, so she left, to use B&M at home. She induced her sisters to leave, for the same home treatment. Martha died, after using B&M for about four months. Elizabeth used B&M for about four months, then returned to the sanitorium. She died three months later. The surviving sister, Margaret, whose tuberculosis was

only moderately advanced when she went home, used B&M for a whole year before she returned to the sanitorium -- her disease far advanced. It was not long before she died. . .

Well, evidence of this kind was not enough to establish a case, under the Food and Drugs Act. The evidence had to show that the manufacturer of B&M knew his preparation would not do what he claimed for it. Many, many cases were investigated. Among them that of Mrs. Edith Merchant, a tuberculosis victim who lived in Ashland, New Hampshire, She wrote testimonials for B&M, claiming she was cured. The manufacturer paid her for this service. While she was on her death bed, her son wrote the testimonials, signed with her name. Her death certificate showed the cause to be -- tuberculosis. The manufacturer of B&M knew of that fact.

By digging out evidence of this kind, the Government finally met the legal requirement of the Food and Drug law, and was able, after ten years, mind you -- to show "bad faith" on the part of the manufacturer of B&M.

Now, quoting your official correspondent directly: "It is not possible to estimate how many people lost their lives by relying on B&M instead of rational treatment, before 1932, when the decision in the Baltimore case forced the manufacturer to stop his false labeling. At the Baltimore trial, the Government introduced 64 certificates, showing the death of B&M users from maladies the labeling promised to cure."

And listen to this, friends -- if you want to get some idea of how many people were using this stuff: For several years, the gross sales of B&M were more than 100 thousand dollars annually. In one year, sales reached a peak of 367 thousand dollars!

Now let's leave the Federal Court in Baltimore, Maryland, and go to Pittsburgh, the home of the manufacturer of another remedy, almost as vicious as B&M.

Quoting your correspondent: "This medicine, manufactured in Pittsburgh by an ex-shirt salesman with no medical training, is still on the market. It is composed largely of extract of the common 'horsetail weed.'"

(By the way, friends, you've heard of that weed before. Housekeepers used it in colonial times to scour their pots and pans. They called it "scouring rush".)

Continuing with your report: "This 'horsetail weed' medicine is recommended for diabetes. It sells for nine dollars a pint. That's the new reduced price. It used to sell for twelve dollars a pint.

"In 1933, the Government lost a case against this medicine. During the trial, medical experts testified that it was -- or rather, is -- utterly worthless. In evidence, the Government offered death certificates of patients who had used it -- and died of diabetes. Some of these unfortunates, shortly before their death, wrote testimonials about the virtues of the stuff they were taking. But the Government could not show that the manufacturer knew of these failures of his medicine. The jury, instructed by the Court of the 'necessity to prove fraud', decided in favor of the manufacturer. He continues to sell his product. And sufferers of diabetes, who could live out a normal span of life if they took insulin, continue to give up that life-saving drug in favor of this worthless remedy -- and the undertaker."

Now still quoting your official correspondent: "These typical examples show the difficulties the Food and Drug Administration is up against in every attempt to protect the public against hundreds of dangerous and worthless nostrums. Because of that loophole in the Food and Drugs Act, 'the necessity to prove fraud', we have this curious situation: The maker of a fake medicine, who doesn't know about the loopholes in the law, may be promptly caught;

another man, who manufactures the same fake medicine with the same untruthful labeling, may continue in business indefinitely -- if he knows how to cover up the evidence of his 'bad faith'. But the result is the same, so far as the victims are concerned. The victim of one is just as dead as the victim of the other.

"The Food and Drug Administration does the best it can, under the law, to protect you against such vicious frauds as B&M and so-called cures for diabetes. However, because under the law the Government must 'prove fraud', unscrupulous manufacturers can continue to sell their worthless products until officials collect enough evidence to show that manufacturers are acting in 'bad faith,' and know that they are.

"If you want further facts about the frauds mentioned today, and about similar frauds, write to the Food and Drug Administration, Washington, D. C.," concludes your official correspondent.

* * *

ANNOUNCEMENT: You have just heard the regular weekly broadcast, "Uncle Sam at Your Service," presented by Station _____ in cooperation with the Food and Drug Administration, U. S. Department of Agriculture. Listen in again next Monday for another report of loopholes in the law.

(NOTE TO BROADCASTERS: The Department of Agriculture uses specific names of products, companies, or individuals only in those cases where all facts have been conclusively proved by the courts. This is true of the B&M product mentioned in this broadcast.)

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Radio Service

OFFICE OF INFORMATION

LIBRARY
U. S. Department of Agriculture

UNCLE SAM AT YOUR SERVICE Monday, November 11, 1935

(FOR BROADCAST USE ONLY)

Reading Time: 8 minutes

ANNOUNCEMENT: Station _____ brings you the regular weekly report from the Food and Drug Administration, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

(NOTE TO BROADCASTERS: The Department of Agriculture uses specific names of products, companies, or individuals only in those cases where all facts have been conclusively proved by the courts. This is true of the B&M product mentioned in this broadcast.)

--ooOoo--

Last Monday, friends, your official correspondent with the "F. & D. A." sent you the first of a series of reports about weaknesses and loopholes in the pure food law.

To be well informed, your correspondent stated, you must have both sides of the picture. For some months past you've heard about the accomplishments of the law, its good points, and how it can protect your food and drug supply. You should also know the weaknesses of the law, and wherein it fails to protect you. . . .

Those of you who heard last Monday's report learned about the so-called diabetes cures on the market, and how they keep the sick and ailing from proper treatment. You learned about such vicious frauds as B. & M., the fake tuberculosis remedy which was responsible for so many deaths during its many long years on the market. You found out that the present law cannot protect you adequately from fake medicines and frauds. Unscrupulous manufacturers go right on selling them, and sick people who don't know any better go right on buying them -- because of a loophole in the Food and Drugs Act.

Well, we won't discuss last week's report now. If you failed to hear it, and if you want to inform yourself about frauds on the market today, write to the Food and Drug Administration, Washington, D. C.

Now to the business at hand, which, quoting your correspondent, "deals with another weakness in the pure food law -- the loophole which makes it possible for unethical manufacturers of foods and drugs to make false claims about their products, in advertising.

Still quoting: "Do you know that the present Food and Drugs Act has no jurisdiction over advertising? Do you know that its authority extends only to labels? If So-and-So's product is mislabeled, and the Government takes legal action against it, and makes So-and-So change his label so that it will tell the truth, he can merely transfer the false claims from the label to advertising.

"Here's how it works," still quoting. "The label of a certain well-known product, still on the market, formerly recommended it for whooping cough, spasmodic croup, bronchial asthma, bronchitis, and other serious diseases. The Food and Drug Administration brought legal action against this product, and the false claims were removed from the label. However, the false claims -- bigger and better than before -- have been continued in advertising. The present law can do nothing about it.

"Another example. The Food and Drug Administration took legal action against a certain mineral water because the label claimed it was a remedy for Bright's disease, rheumatism, arthritis, gout, nephritis, cystitis, bladder trouble, and other diseases. The claims were removed from the label. They were simply transferred to advertising, where they have been amplified. They now include heart disease, nervous disorders, and the like.

"One more example -- a vegetable compound. At one time," states your correspondent, "its labels claimed, falsely of course, that the product would cure every kind of disease known to women. Years ago, the manufacturer of this vegetable compound paid a fine for false labeling. And now this so-called boon to woman-kind is widely sold under a label which merely states: 'Recommended as a vegetable tonic in conditions for which this preparation is adapted.' However, advertising matter, over which the Food and Drugs Act has no control, asserts that this compound is beneficial for nerve troubles, pains in the side, rundown conditions, and other disorders. Draw your own conclusion about the value of this product," says your official reporter. "Just remember that the law does not limit the extent to which truthful claims may appear on labels."

Now here's still another example of how far a manufacturer can go in advertising his goods, and still obey the law so far as the label is concerned.

Continuing with your report: "Manufacturers of a well-known product, advertised in leading periodicals, have appealed for a wider use of their preparation under such headings as 'Tuberculosis,' 'Pneumonia,' and other serious diseases. Such representations do not appear in the labeling.

"These examples," explains your correspondent, "could be multiplied indefinitely. If you will carefully compare the advertising claims for foods and drugs with the label claims, you will find, in too many instances, that advertising claims go far beyond those printed on the labels, or in the circulars accompanying the goods in interstate trade. Twenty-nine years' enforcement of the law has corrected the labeling of thousands of foods and drugs. But the average consumer is far more influenced by advertising than by labels."

Now, so that you may get a true picture of advertising, your correspondent reminds you that many newspapers, magazines and radio stations will not accept untruthful advertising. They will accept only advertising that has been carefully scrutinized for truth and accuracy. Many manufacturers, too, hold their advertising claims strictly within the bounds of truth.

Quoting directly: "The unpleasant facts in today's report do not apply to the great majority of manufacturers, newspapers, magazines, and radio stations. There are a few, however, who take advantage of the fact that the present food and drugs law has no jurisdiction over the advertising of their worthless and sometimes dangerous products.

"The Food and Drug Administration does all it can, under the present law, to protect you against falsely labeled foods and medicines. However, since it has no jurisdiction over false advertising claims, it can not proceed against unscrupulous manufacturers who advertise their products for 57 varieties of diseases -- and see to it that their labeling conforms with the law.

"If you want further facts about the subjects discussed in today's report," concludes your correspondent, "write to the Food and Drug Administration, Washington, D. C."

--ooOoo--

ANNOUNCEMENT: You have just heard the regular weekly broadcast, "Uncle Sam at Your Service," presented by Station _____ in cooperation with the Food and Drug Administration, U. S. Department of Agriculture. Listen in again next Monday for another report of loopholes in the present law.

#####

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Radio Service

OFFICE OF INFORMATION

LIBRARY RECEIVED ★ 1935 ★ U. S.

UNCLE SAM AT YOUR SERVICE Monday, November 18, 1935

(FOR BROADCAST USE ONLY)

Reading Time: 10 minutes

(NOTE TO BROADCASTERS: The Department of Agriculture makes public specific names of products, companies, or individuals only in those cases where all facts are a matter of court record. This is true of Radithor, mentioned in this broadcast.)

ANNOUNCEMENT: Station _____ brings you the regular weekly report from the Food and Drug Administration, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

--ooOoo--

Ladies, if your plans for making yourselves more beautiful during the holiday season include a certain radium treatment, you're bound to be disappointed. That is, if you are counting on a radium treatment offered by a certain English manufacturer. This radium beauty treatment, at least its most dangerous items, have been refused entry at the port of Baltimore. Unfortunately for the manufacturer, his labels bore claims to remedy disease as well as for beautifying effect, thus classifying his products legally as drugs and permitting their exclusion from this country under the import provisions of the Food and Drugs Act against drugs that are dangerous to health. Cosmetics, sold simply as beautifiers, are subject to neither import nor domestic provisions of the law. But that is another story. . . .

According to your official correspondent with the Food and Drug Administration, the radium treatment excluded at Baltimore included a face tonic, a night cream, a day cream, a hormone cream, a vitamin cream, lipstick, and lipstick matches. Also a reducing sponge -- whatever that is.

Folders accompanying the beauty treatment included these statements: "All our creams are the result of years of study and experience by medical authorities... They can be recommended for any type of skin and will cure even the most blemished complexion. Wrinkles and impurities disappear never to return."

Well, in spite of those claims, the Food and Drug Administration, more interested in the public health than in beautiful complexions, refused to allow these radium preparations to come into the country; -- refused them entry because of their "false therapeutic claims." The night cream and the hormone cream contained radium "in amounts injurious to health."

States your correspondent: "The Food and Drug Administration refuses entry to shipments of radioactive preparations offered for entry into the United States and offered for general distribution, on the ground that they may be dangerous to the health of the people of the United States. "However," and this is underscored, "<u>However, radioactive drugs sold in interstate commerce are not actionable, under the present Food and Drugs Act, if not misbranded</u>, even though they may be a health hazard. An outstanding example of this latter type of product was Radithor (<u>Ray</u>-duh-thor), the medicine which killed Eben M. Byers, a prominent citizen of Pittsburgh."

And now, friends, mention of Radithor, and the tragic results of its use, brings us to another loophole in the present Food and Drug law. But let your correspondent tell the story, in his own words:

"When Eben M. Byers lost his health, he was persuaded to dose himself with 'Radithor certified radium water.' Like many ill people, he was willing to try anything that offered a cure. Perhaps he reasoned that if Radithor didn't cure him, at least it wouldn't do him any harm. But the medicine killed him. It literally disintegrated the bones of his head.

"After Mr. Byers' tragic death, caustic editorials appeared in the newspapers, criticizing the Government for allowing such a deadly drug to be sold. The editors demanded to know why the Food and Drugs Act wasn't enforced.

"The editors, alas, in common with most well-informed people, were assuming that the Food and Drugs law prohibits the sale of drugs that are dangerous to health when used according to directions on the bottle or in advertising. Unfortunately," still quoting your correspondent, "the present law does not prohibit nor restrict the sale of dangerous drugs. These dangerous drugs are subject to legal action only when their labels bear 'false and fraudulent' curative claims, or misrepresent the identity of the ingredients. The label of the medicine that killed Byers bore only a statement that 'Radithor' was a radium-active water."

Continuing with your report: "Radithor is by no means the only dangerous medicine. You have heard of cinchophen (sin-ko-fin), spelled c-i-n-c-h-o-p-h-e-n used in preparations recommended for rheumatism, neuritis, and similar disorders. Cinchophen injures the liver. Among many reports on the deadly effect of cinchophen is one from the Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minnesota, describing five fatalities. Another report, appearing in October, 1932, in The Annals of Internal Medicine, described six deaths from cinchophen poisoning. Four of these deaths were caused by one proprietary medicine. Such reports multiply as time goes on. The present Food and Drugs law does not even require that cinchophen be declared on the label of drugs that contain it," according to your official correspondent.

Now let's see what your reporter has to say about "pain killers." I'm quoting:

"Numerous deaths have resulted from overdosages of headache powders containing acetanilid (as-et-an-i-lid), spelled a-c-e-t-a-n-i-l-i-d. Aside from the knockout punch of an overdose of acetanilid, if it's taken over long periods of time it may destroy the power of the red corpuscles to carry oxygen. The victim turns blue; serious illness and death may follow. While acetanilid is one of the few drugs the present law does require to be declared on the labels, the record of tragedies from its use (and the record grows longer and longer), shows that mere label declaration is not enough. The ordinary purchaser cannot avoid the dangers of this drug, unless the label warns him against misuse.

"Another notorious pain-killed," I'm still quoting, "is amidopyrine (a-mee-doe-pye-reen), spelled a-m-i-d-o-p-y-r-i-n-e, found in many pain relievers especially those recommended for women. Now amidopyrine does not have a bad effect on everybody who takes it, but in those who are susceptible, it curtails or destroys the function of the tissues that make white blood corpuscles. The effect is so insidious that you may not recognize the danger until too late. The percentage of deaths among people susceptible to the drug is very high."

Well, ladies, I don't know how you're going to tell whether the medicine you're taking contains amidopyrine or not, unless you take the trouble to write to the Food and Drug Administration at Washington. The present law does not require even a label declaration of amidopyrine. So states your correspondent, pointing out that this is one of the most dangerous loopholes in the present law.

Now, what is a "drug," as defined by the present law? Here's the answer: "The definition of 'drug' in the present law limits legal jurisdiction to preparations recognized in the United States Pharmacopoeia (far-ma-ko-pee-a), and the National Formulary, and to other substances 'intended to be used for the cure, mitigation or prevention of disease.' The law, the present law, does not

control drugs used for the diagnosis of disease, nor those intended to affect bodily structure or function. For example, 'slenderizing' preparations are not legally drugs, although the public generally regards them as such."

Now, friends, we come to a familiar topic. You've heard several discussions of the dangerous fat-reducers on the market, so this next part of your report will be a review. Continuing:

"The present law has no authority over the deluge of dangerous dinitrophenol (dye-nye-tro-phee-nol) fat reducers that have recently sprung up all over the country. Dinitrophenol actually does reduce weight, by speeding the body processes and literally burning the tissues, including fat. But it may produce the same blood disorder caused by amidopyrine. The list of dinitrophenol victims continues to increase, despite wide publicity given to instances of death blindness and death.

"Drugs may be beneficial, or deadly. Because of loopholes in the present Food and Drugs law, there are on the market drugs that are dangerous to health when taken as directed by the manufacturer. Many potent drugs do not bear label warnings against probable misuse. Excepting a few potent substances, the law does not require a declaration of ingredients on the label, so that the user may know what he is taking."

And so concludes today's report, the third in a series dealing with weaknesses of the present Food and Drug law. If you want a copy of today's report, for further study, write to the Food and Drug Administration, Washington, D. C.

--ooOoo--

ANNOUNCEMENT: You have just heard the regular weekly broadcast, "Uncle Sam at Your Service," presented by Station _____ in cooperation with the Food and Drug Administration, U. S. Department of Agriculture. Listen in again next Monday for another report of loopholes in the present law.

#####

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Radio Service

OFFICE OF INFORMATION

UNCLE SAM AT YOUR SERVICE Monday, November 25, 1935

(FOR BROADCAST USE ONLY)

Reading Time: 10 minutes

(NOTE TO BROADCASTERS: The Department of Agriculture makes public specific names of products, companies, or individuals only in those cases where all facts are a matter of court record.)

ANNOUNCEMENT: Station _____ brings you the regular weekly report from the Food and Drug Administration, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

--ooOoo--

Today's report, my friends, deals with fake devices sold to change the shape of your nose. . . . machines guaranteed to add three or four inches to your height. . . . contraptions which claim to make your hair grow.

It also deals with fake devices falsely claimed to be useful in the treatment of disease. These include contraptions advertised to cure rupture, necklaces recommended for goiter, worthless and dangerous devices for the hard of hearing, radium devices alleged to cure all diseases -- including cancer.

Under the present law, the Food and Drug Administration has no authority to seize such products and remove them from sale, or to prosecute the manufacturers who falsely claim that their products are useful in the treatment of disease. That is one of the loopholes in the present law, according to your official correspondent with the Food and Drug Administration.

Now before we discuss the more dangerous devices, let's look at this list of worthless machines, gadgets, and plain junk, alleged to make the average human being better looking.

Here's something guaranteed to make you taller -- to add from three to five inches to your height. To increase your height, you lie down on a frame, with your head and feet strapped to the frame, while an attendant turns a crank. You are stretched both ways at once. You take a little stretching today, a little more tomorrow, and so on until you have added the desired inches to your height.

Now, quoting your correspondent: "If you have spent seventy-five dollars for this machine, it's probably too late to get your money back. However, it's not too late to learn the sad news that no device, yet invented, will add a cubit to your stature."

(Look here, my Washington friend -- I'm not so gullible as to spend 75 dollars for a stretching contraption!)

Let's see what's next. . . . If you don't like the first machine, here's another device to make you taller. It looks like a pair of suspenders tied together. You place the suspenders under your chin, run each end through a pulley, and by means of handles on the suspenders -- or cords -- you pull yourself up on your tiptoes. . . .

What's this next piece of tomfoolery? The "Sculptron" -- to perfect the shape of your nose. You can wear the sculptron while you sleep, rest, or work. (No, thanks -- not while I work. It looks too much like a dog muzzle, to suit me.) The "Sculptron" is made of aluminum, padded with chamois skin. It claims to be the mold of a perfect nose. There are springs between the aluminum and the chamois skin. According to the manufacturer: The Sculptron "is the final result of a long period of careful thought. . . Thousands of Sculptrons are being used the world over. Letters pour in from South Africa to Alaska -- from Asis, Australia, South America, Europe -- the Sculptron has been sent to the four corners of the earth. It knows no boundary lines nor nationalities. It is a boon to mankind everywhere."

Well, be that as it may, the more I see of this contraption, the better satisfied I am with the shape of my nose. It's good enough for all practical purposes, at home and abroad. Besides, wearing such a device as the Sculptron wouldn't change the shape anyway.

Next, how about a device to make your hair grow? Here are two -- you can take your choice.

The early model, as advertised some time ago, was a vacuum cap guaranteed to make hair grow. The optimistic victim of this fraud sat in a chair, and worked a handle attached to a pump. The pump, in turn, was attached to a vacuum cup which fitted over the victim's bald head. "The effect of the vacuum," I'm quoting from the advertisement, "is pleasant and exhilarating."

Yes, but did it make hair grow?

Now if you think the hand pump vacuum cap is a little old-fashioned, I can show you a recent model, more in keeping with the scientific spirit of the times. This is another cap, with a coil of wire fitted inside a silk lining. Put the cap on your head. Then connect the cap with a light circuit, and it will generate "infra-red" rays. In other words, heat rays, the same kind of rays you get from a red hot stove.

Is there any evidence to prove that infra-red rays will grow hair? According to your official report, there is no such evidence. . . .

From now on, I'm going to quote directly from your official report, which shows some of the serious results of a food and drug law that allows fake devices to be falsely advertised to cure diseases.

Quoting directly: "Tens of thousands of people die annually through temporizing with fake devices alleged to produce miraculous cures. Symptoms of early cancer and of other serious diseases often resemble closely those of

simple ailments, but the only hope lies in early diagnosis and proper treatment. Mistaken reliance on worthless gadgets merely lets the disease progress to incurable stages. The health of the patient may not alone be at stake; that of other members of society, including the unborn, may be endangered by ineffective treatment.

"Not all fake devices are dangerous. Some are sheer frauds, like most of those guaranteed to make the human form divine by refashioning the ill-shaped nose, lips, face, neck, arms, chest, abdomen, hips, legs, ankles, feet. These devices are usually equipped with rollers, wheels or suction cups, alleged to remove excess fat and muscle where unwanted, and to build up these same tissues in scrawny places. Some are sold to straighten bowlegs and knock-knees; others to increase the height of adults by three to five inches; still others to cure baldness.

"Gadgets advertised to cure rupture and thus permit the user to throw away his truss may be just another but less effecient form of truss.

"Several devices worn externally are honestly sold as aids to hearing. But deafness 'cures' are sometimes merely rubber or metal trinkets, to be worn in the outer canal of the ear, usually as artificial ear drums. They seriously increase the danger of ear infections. Incidentally, they are claimed <u>to cure deafness</u>, and at the same time <u>to diminish the volume of sound</u> heard by those working in boiler shops."

Still quoting: "Radium devices, including water jars, have been extensively sold. If they are radioactive, they are extremely dangerous for unskilled use; if they are not radioactive they are simply junk. Some radium devices are alleged to make the old young and to cure all diseases, including cancer.

Electric belts, pads, plates and machines, sold under similar claims, are common. Necklaces of glass beads strung on wire have been advertised to cure all afflictions by selecting health-giving and germ-killing radio waves from the air. Other necklaces with alternate discs of copper and zinc between the beads were supposed to generate enough electricity to cure goiter.

"For almost every disease and deformity known to man or beast, there is sold a fake device, appliance, contraption, or machine. The present food and drug law has no jurisdiction over them," concludes your correspondent, "no authority to seize and remove them from sale, and no authority to prosecute the manufacturers who falsely claim that such devices are useful in the treatment of disease."

That's all of today's report. If you want further facts about the subjects discussed today, write to the Food and Drug Administration, Washington, D. C.

--ooOoo--

ANNOUNCEMENT: You have just heard the regular weekly broadcast, "Uncle Sam at Your Service," presented by Station _____ in cooperation with the Food and Drug Administration, U. S. Department of Agriculture. Listen in again next Monday for another discussion of loopholes in the present law.

######

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Radio Service

OFFICE OF INFORMATION

UNCLE SAM AT YOUR SERVICE

Monday, December 2, 1935

(FOR BROADCAST USE ONLY)

Speaking Time: 10 minutes

ANNOUNCEMENT: Station _____ brings you now the regular weekly report from the Food and Drug Administration of the United States Department of Agriculture.

--ooOoo--

Today's report continues the series pointing out some of the difficulties that face the officers in charge of enforcing the Federal legislation designed to protect consumers of foods and drugs. One recent report pointed out how protection of the public health is hampered by the provisions of the present law making it necessary to prove that the manufacturer of a worthless nostrum knows that it is worthless. Another report explained that the provisions of the present law apply only to the labeling of the package in which a drug or packaged food is sold, not to the advertising of the product elsewhere than on the label. A third report made it clear that present food and drug legislation does not require many potent drugs to be labeled with warning against possible misuse, so that the user may know what he is taking. Last week the Federal Food and Drug officers sent us a report pointing out that the present law gives no jursidiction to the Food and Drug Administration which would enable it to halt the sale of fake contraptions or machines offered to sufferers from all sorts of diseases, abnormal conditions, or offered to beautify the person of the user.

Now comes today, a report explaining among other things, the difficulties involved in keeping unscrupulous men from selling consumers water at the price of oysters, and cheating buyers through other means of food adulteration.

Let's start with oysters. The report from the Food and Drug Administration says this:

"Of course, shucked oysters require a certain amount of washing to free them from sand, bits of shell, and other impurities. 'Blowing', as this cleaning process is called, need not take more than three minutes. Some packers, however, are absent-minded. They leave their oysters in the blower rather longer than is necessary merely to clean them. Now oysters like fresh water. They lap it up. Naturally, the more fresh water they absorb, the more they increase in size, and become adulterated.

"'Adulterated' is not a popular word among consumers who buy food. The Government tries to protect consumers against adulterated food -- against watered oysters. Not long ago an Oyster Company in the East was charged with adulterating oysters with water. When the case was tried, the Judge took occasion to praise the Food and Drug Administration for its zeal in behalf of the public. The Judge condemned the fraudulent practice of selling water as oysters. But -- the Judge dismissed the case, because the total solids of oysters vary under different conditions, and no legal standard has been determined for them.

"This is but one of a number of actions which the Government has brought against allegedly adulterated or misbranded foods, only to have the case thrown out of court because there are no legal standards of identity for the products on trial. Officials of the Food and Drug Administration acknowledge that they are going to have an uphill fight in their efforts to prevent the sale of waterlogged oysters so long as there are no legal standards for oysters.

"Now, for many foods, the Department of Agriculture <u>has</u> adopted administrative standards based on the best commercial practice. But such a standard is merely <u>advisory</u>. It has none of the force and effect of <u>law</u>. Manufacturers comply with it only as they see fit.

"To show how this situation hampers efforts to protect consumers and honest manufacturers, let's attend the trial of a typical case involving one of these 'merely advisory' standards -- that of a product sold as strawberry jam. To the Food and Drug Administration, 'jam' means only the kind of preserves the housewife makes out of about equal parts of fresh fruit and sugar. In terms of weight, this means not less than forty-five parts of fruit to fifty-five parts of sugar. The Department of Agriculture has adopted an administrative standard for jam, based on these proportions.

"Now, in the trial of our typical jam case, the Government alleges that a mixture containing less than half as much fruit as the housewife would use is not a real strawberry jam, but an imitation, and should be branded as such. Housewives appear as witnesses for the Government, to tell how they make jam. Manufacturers who conform to the standard also testify as to the proportions of fruit and sugar they use. In other words, if this standard is to have any significance in court, it must be supported by competent evidence. And every single time a new jam case comes to trial, the Government must establish validity of this standard again. As anybody can see -- the Food and Drug Administration has to go through with many a tedious and expensive court procedure, to assure the consumer good honest jam for the morning buttered toast.

"In every case it brings against fake jams, the Government must put on a long parade of witnesses, no matter how often the cases arise. There are about 90 Federal judicial districts. If the standard is upheld in the trial of X brand jam in one judicial district, it must again be established by the same procedure in cases on that brand arising in any other district, and on any other brand even in the same district."

Continuing, our Food and Drug Administration report says:

"We've said enough about the difficulties in stopping adulteration of foods for which no standards are fixed by law. Now to show how fixing standards by law removes difficulties in stopping adulteration, consider how much easier it is to protect consumers against adulteration of butter.

"There are legal standards for butter. Butter consists of fat, water, salt, and curd, the most important ingredient, of course, being the fat. Home-churned butter and the usual creamery product vary a good deal in the percentage of fat and water. At one time the fat content of creamery butter ranged from sixty-five to eighty-five per cent. In an attempt to bring order out of such a chaotic condition, the Department of Agriculture announced an administrative standard requiring not less than eighty-two and one-half percent fat. But a case against butter containing less than 80 percent fat failed because the Court held the standard was not legally binding. Certain manufacturers then worked more and more water into their butter.

"With the Federal authorities helpless to protect them, consumers continued to buy water at butter prices until the cheat was remedied by an act of Congress. Under that law a standard for butter was set up which requires not less than eighty percent of fat. Production has been stabilized at this figure.

"Does the butter shipped in interstate commerce ever fall below the legal standard? Yes, a very small percentage of it. When such butter is shipped, the variations from the legal standard are usually slight and easy to deal with. If a butter case gets to court, the Government has only to prove that the brand in question contains less than the specified proportion of fat, and the case is over and done with.

"There's no long and expensive court procedure, no summoning of housewives who churn butter, of manufacturers who make butter on a large scale -- every time a butter case comes to trial, as there is when a jam case is tried. The reason -- we have legal standards for butter, and no legal standards for jam."

Concluding, our food and drug report today says:

"Far-sighted manufacturers in most food industries today are in favor of legal standards with the full force and effect of law. The canners themselves were responsible for the McNary-Mapes amendment to the food and drugs act. The 'Canners' Bill' authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to set up legal standards of quality, condition, and fill of container for every generic class of canned foods except meat and meat products and canned milk, and required that foods which failed to meet the standard declare that fact on their labels.

"This strengthening of the food and drugs act has proved of enormous value in protecting consumers."

--ooOoo--

CLOSING ANNOUNCEMENT: You have just heard one of a regular weekly series of programs, called "Uncle Sam at Your Service," presented by Station _____ in cooperation with the Food and Drug Administration of the United States Department of Agriculture. Tune in again at this time next Monday.

#####

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Radio Service
OFFICE OF INFORMATION

UNCLE SAM AT YOUR SERVICE Monday, December 9, 1935

(FOR BROADCAST USE ONLY)

Reading Time: 10 minutes

(NOTE TO BROADCASTERS: The Department of Agriculture makes public specific names of products, individuals, or companies only in those cases where all facts are a matter of court record. This is true of Bred Spred Strawberry Flavor, Stardom's Hollywood Dietade, Instant Alberty's Food, and Syl-vette mentioned in this release.)

ANNOUNCEMENT: Station _____ brings you the regular weekly report from the Food and Drug Administration, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

--ooOoo--

Today's report from your official correspondent with the Food and Drug Administration constitutes a warning concerning some of the ways the housewife may be cheated in buying packaged foods under fanciful trade names, because of loopholes in the present Federal Food and Drugs Act.

Of course, packaged food sold in interstate commerce is fit to eat -- the consumer can thank the pure food law for that! Whatever might have been said about some of the practices in the food industry before the Food and Drug law was passed 30 years ago, nowadays manufacturers don't try to cover up the use of filthy or decomposed materials with harmful preservatives to make the food smell right, or injurious dyes to make it look right.

But for all the present Food and Drug law's effectiveness in insuring the wholesomeness of your food, says your official correspondent, it has certain loopholes that make it easy for unscrupulous manufacturers to play all sorts of tricks upon the housewife if she does not watch out. Quoting your correspondent:

"To illustrate what may happen, consider a product called 'Bred Spred Strawberry Flavor'. This product was the subject of legal action a few years ago. The dull blue label of the product bore a picture of two luscious red strawberries. The description of the product read: 'Bred Spred, Net Weight 14½ ounces, Strawberry Flavor, Guaranteed Free from Artificial Color, Flavor or Preservative.' The jar was filled to the brim with an inviting jam-like substance sprinkled with sure-enough strawberry seeds. Certainly it looked like the genuine 50-50 fresh-fruit-and-sugar preserves a housewife would make herself.

"But this tasty-looking concoction contained less than half as much fruit as real jam. Anyone who bought it paid fruit prices for sugar and water, with a little pectin and some added acid to pep up the flavor. But they couldn't know this because the Food and Drug Acts does not require the manufacturer to give this information.

"Now the Food and Drug Administration, which tries as far as it possibly can under the present law to protect the housewife against food cheats, called Bred Spred an 'economic fraud'. That didn't mean that the mixture was not perfectly wholesome, appetizing food. It just wasn't the pure preserves the housewife thought she was getting when she bought 'strawberry jam'. Under the circumstances, the Government alleged that Bred Spred was an imitation and ought to be labeled as such."

Still quoting your official correspondent:

"That case exposed an interesting loophole -- a joker, really -- in the Food and Drugs Act. For Bred Spred was not labeled a jam. It was labeled simply 'Bred Spred'. And what was Bred Spred?

"Well, the court, when a seizure of Bred Spred was tried in Davenport, Iowa, in 1930, ruled that the product was in a class by itself, with its own 'distinctive name'. Since it was sold under that name, it came within the

distinctive name clause of the law -- and that clause is the joker mentioned -- which exempted it from the provisions applying to deceptive products. The product is no longer sold -- the manufacturer, after winning the action, started making and marketing a true preserve, sold as a preserve, and accurately labeled as such."

Says your correspondent: "The Bred Spred product that was haled into court is but one example of numerous compounds that conceal their true identity under fanciful names. Another of more recent date is called 'Stardom's Hollywood Dietade'. A libel has been filed against it in Federal Court. The Government alleges its label gives no hint of what it contains. The label directs the consumer to skip one or two of his regular meals and take instead a heaping teaspoon of 'Dietade' in skim milk or fruit juice. This mysterious substance is supposed to satisfy his appetite for the meals he misses. But the government analysis reported to the court showed it to contain nothing more remarkable than soybean flour, sugar, cocoa, salt, vanilla and lime phosphate. A seven-ounce can retails at one dollar. The total cost of ingredients is about eight cents.

"Now," says your correspondent, "let's look at some other packaged foods against which legal action was taken.

"For example, Instant Alberty's Food. It is an accessory food for adults and children, and is marked $1.35. The composition of this product, as analyzed by the Food and Drug Administration, is dried milk and starch. Twenty cents' worth of dried milk and starch for $1.35.

"Another packaged food proceeded against was Syl-vette, guaranteed free from thyroid or laxatives of any kind. It was advertised as a reducing diet. But it is made of sugar -- 65 percent of this so-called 'reducing diet' was sugar. You could reduce as fast with an equal amount of candy. Syl-vette also

contained starch, cocoa, salt and a dash of celery seed. Six cents' worth of these simple ingredients would cost you a dollar if you had bought them under this fanciful name.

"An example of a product against which proceedings can not be brought because of loopholes in the law, is labeled as a spread for sandwiches. It's nothing but chicken skins. The analysis showed no meat. The actual cost of this product to the manufacturer was one penny. It sells at 15 cents.

"Now it is not within the province of food and drug legislation to control food prices," your correspondent points out. But he quotes the United States Supreme Court, which said in one decision:

"It is too plain for argument that a manufacturer or vendor has no constitutional right to sell goods without giving to the purchaser fair information as to what it is that is being sold." (That's the end of the quotation from the Supreme Court decision.)

That quotation leads your correspondent to point to another loophole in the present Food and Drug law. It doesn't compel the manufacturer to give you complete information on the label so that you can know exactly what you are buying. It forbids him to tell lies on his label, but it does not say that he must tell the whole truth. Quoting your correspondent again:

"Even foods sold under common, everyday names may fool the housewife sometimes. For instance, there is a wide variety of prepared desserts -- "lemon pudding" and "chocolate pudding" and still others with fancy trade names that give no hint at all of what they contain.

"What would you expect chocolate pudding to be made of? Well, one housewife may make it out of cornstarch, cocoa, milk, sugar and eggs. Another may never use eggs -- just cornstarch, milk, and sugar with a little cocoa to flavor.

"Let's see what it says on the package offered under the label 'chocolate pudding'. It doesn't tell what the pudding powder is made of. But it gives directions for serving this 'ready prepared' dessert: You add a little milk and sugar to the powder, and cook it for a few minutes.....

"In other words, the manufacturer has saved the consumer the trouble of adding the cocoa to the cornstarch! And for this service he charges more for a few ounces of flavored cornstarch than the consumer would have to pay for a whole pound of cornstarch under its own name! Because the manufacturer is not required to and does not voluntarily state the ingredients of the product on the package, the consumer finds it hard to detect the fact that he's paying a steep price for common articles."

"Recently," says your correspondent, "a mother took her ailing little daughter to a specialist in allergy (al-lur-gee). (Spelled a-l-l-e-r-g-y.) The doctor had previously found that the child was sensitive to eggs, and that when she ate foods containing eggs she suffered attacks of asthma. The mother had tried scrupulously to keep all such foods away from her, but the asthma had come back. The doctor's questions brought out that the mother had seen an advertisement promising that a wonderful proprietary food, said to have been discovered by a renowned Swiss chemist, would help underweight, nervous children. She bought a package. The label did not say that the food contained 3 per cent dried egg. It did not list any of the ingredients. The mother had no way of knowing that she was feeding her child the very thing that made her ill.

"Medical authorities say," your correspondent continues, "that a large part of the population is allergic to one kind of food or another. Some people are made violently ill by foods that do not 'agree' with them. Many people have a pronounced idiosyncrasy for strawberries or eggs. Others are sensitive to cottonseed oil, wheat or rye flour, tomatoes or so on. They can protect themselves only if they are given a fair opportunity to know what they're buying.

"The Food and Drug Administration does all it can under the present law to protect such people against deceptively labeled foods. But it has no authority to require the declaration of ingredients on the label. Therefore, it is helpless to compel food manufacturers to reveal everything their products contain.

"If you want further facts about the subjects discussed in today's report," concludes your correspondent, "write to the Food and Drug Administration, Washington, D. C."

--oOo--

ANNOUNCEMENT: You have just heard the regular weekly broadcast, "Uncle Sam at Your Service," presented by Station _____ in cooperation with the Food and Drug Administration, U. S. Department of Agriculture. Listen in again next Monday for another report on what can and what cannot be done under existing Federal law to protect the health and pocketbooks of food and drug users.

#####

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Radio Service

OFFICE OF INFORMATION

UNCLE SAM AT YOUR SERVICE Monday, December 16, 1935

(FOR BROADCAST USE ONLY)

Reading Time: 10 minutes

ANNOUNCEMENT: Station _____ brings you now the regular weekly report from the Food and Drug Administration, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

--oOOoo--

The report we get today from our official correspondent with the Food and Drug Administration deals with the poisons we eat with our meals and the difficulties the food and drug control officers of the Federal Government encounter in trying to prevent our getting enough of them to do us harm.

A few weeks ago you may have read in your newspaper of the tragedies in San Francisco, when three people were killed and twenty more were made desperately ill by baking soda which had somehow been contaminated with sodium fluoride -- a common ingredient of roach powders -- and with arsenic. It seems that a local salvage company had purchased damaged packages of a wellknown brand of baking soda from a steamship company, and that in bulking or re-packaging, the poisons had been mixed with the soda, probably by accident.

Now all this happened right around San Francisco. The damaged packages were bought, repackaged and sold again in California. There was no question of interstate commerce and so the Federal Government had no jurisdiction. That is not to say that Uncle Sam's officials did not cooperate in the investigation and give all possible help. They did. And they stood ready to take legal action the moment there was any indication that they could.

Your correspondent refers to the incident by way of pointing out to you the limitations on Federal authority. Though the soda in its original, unbroken packages had been shipped into California from another State, by the time the salvage company distributed the product to its victims, it had become "commingled with the property of the State" and had passed beyond the control of the Federal pure food and drug law. Only State and local officials could do anything about it. And of course they did! They snapped into action immediately.

The story, however, reminds your correspondent of another instance of accidental contamination of a food with poison in which Federal officers played the role of rescuers. It was just at this season, some 5 years ago, that an arsenic-laden Christmas fruitcake led officials of two governments a desperate chase in their efforts to protect some family in the United States or Canada from serious injury or possible death.

The excitement started when four people in Virginia became violently ill after eating a cake. Samples of it, fed to test animals, in the Food and Drug laboratories, caused them to show symptoms of poisoning. Inspector Larrick of the Food and Drug Administration got on the job at once and found that the poisoned cake was one of nine which a housekeeper had baked for the Christmas trade. With one exception, all the cakes were quickly accounted for.

But that one exception proved elusive! It took several days of high-powered sleuthing to run it down, and it was found just in the nick of time. A house-to-house agent, whose name and address nobody knew, had purchased it as a Christmas gift for relatives in Canada. When these people were finally located, they were warned by a long-distance telephone call to beware of their tempting-looking but homicidal present.

Meanwhile, the Canadian legation in Washington, whose officers Inspector Larrick had enlisted to help, took prompt steps to have the cake retrieved by

Dominion authorities before it could do any damage. When at last it turned up in the Food and Drug laboratories, gay with seals, ribbons and wishes for a "Merry Christmas," it bore also the official seal of the Canadian government and on ominous "Poison" warning.

The poison had got into the cake by accident. It was found to be an arsenical insecticide, which had been purchased for use in the cake-baker's garden. One of the children in the family, seeing the sack of white powder on the shelf, had thought it was flour and dumped it in the flour bin without saying anything to anybody about it.

Not content to seize the contaminated food, the Food and Drug Administration took occasion to warn the public against the careless handling of poisons in the household, pointing out that "Poisons in the pantry are dangerous as a gun!"

So much for accidental contamination of food products. Sometimes food is contaminated by toxic metals, such as lead, from utensils or machinery in the factory. Or, on the other hand, the manufacturer may use some injurious substance as a regular feature of his processing without bothering to find out what effect it might have on consumers.

Your correspondent says that not long ago he heard of a wine-maker on the Pacific Coast who was using fluorides to control fermentation. Perhaps this man didn't know that these chemicals are harmful. Though, of course, he had no right NOT to know what he was using in the manufacture of a food for human consumption! Large doses of this poison, as in the San Francisco soda cases, may cause death or horrible illness. And smaller amounts taken regularly, if unwittingly, in the drinking water have been shown to cause mottled enamel in teeth. Indeed, the Public Health Service regards the contamination of drinking water with fluorine, which occurs in certain areas of the United States, as a very serious health problem.

This wine, however, we hasten to assure you, is not now on the market, so you need not worry about it. But Food and Drug law enforcement officials have to be constantly on the lookout for such things. Their eternal vigilance is the price of your safety!

Now, to quote your correspondent directly: "Modern methods of producing and manufacturing foods involve many hazards of contamination with poisons. Temptation to add preservatives to perishable foods always exists, as does the impulse to add chemicals for coloring, bleaching or otherwise enhancing the appearance of food products. These substances are not always free from poisons.

"Many years ago, some ingenious individual discovered, quite by chance, that a very small amount of arsenical spray would hasten the ripening of oranges and permit him to take advantage of the early premium market. However, oranges from trees sprayed with arsenic contained a good deal less acid. In consequence, they had a decidedly flat taste, though, unfortunately, they did meet the literal requirements of the State law. There was no danger to health, but the practice was essentially fraudulent. The States have since adopted legal means to prevent this kind of spraying.

"The chemical sprays that farmers use on their growing crops to protect them from insects are an entirely different matter," says your correspondent. "Without them, insect pests would soon destroy our fruits and vegetables and deprive us of necessary foods.

"One of the most effective insecticides is arsenic. This is perfectly all right to use, PROVIDED the grower takes care to wash off the poisonous residue before he markets his crop. He can further minimize any possible danger to consumers by following a proper spray schedule. Most growers do take these precautions.

"But suppose the farmer, through ignorance or carelessness, does not bother to remove the poison before he ships his produce in interstate commerce. If he does thus violate the pure food law, it is the duty of Federal officials to seize his pears or cauliflower or whatever it may be before the product reaches consumers. Every year, indeed, the Food and Drug Administration devotes a major part of its efforts to preventing the distribution of foods which contain poisonous residues. So far as interstate traffic goes, the situation is well under control.

"It so happens that Nature creates few foods which are absolutely free from poisons. Arsenic, especially, is widely distributed in nature, and it probably isn't possible to keep it entirely out of our food supply. Various sea foods are high in arsenic, though there is no evidence that this kind of arsenic may be danger to human beings.

"Since we can't eliminate poisons altogether, another question naturally arises: How much poison, or rather, how little, can we tolerate in the food we buy and still maintain our good health? So far as arsenic is concerned, experts have answered this question. They say that food should not contain more than 1/100 grain of the added poison per pound of solid food or per gallon of liquids. This standard is called the 'international tolerance for arsenic.'

"A tolerance for any specified poison is simply the amount of that poison which the human system can tolerate without danger to health. Administrative tolerances for several poisons have been announced, but they have no legal force. They have to be established again and again, in each contested case, through the testimony of outstanding experts in toxicology. No matter how frequently the identical issues arise throughout the country, or even in the same judicial district, the Government has to prove to a court and jury that the food contains

added poison; that the poison may make the food dangerous to health; and actually how much of the poison might have that effect.

"This is a serious weakness in the present Food and Drugs Act. There is no good reason why the addition of poisons should not be flatly prohibited -- except, of course, in those cases where it is required in production and cannot be avoided by good practice. Where the use of poisons is really necessary, as in the protection of growing fruits and vegetables against insects and plant diseases, there should be some provision for tolerances that would be legal in every case.

"If you are interested in learning more about this subject, write to the Food and Drug Administration in Washington."

--ooOoo--

ANNOUNCEMENT: And with that invitation we conclude the direct quotation from the report of your correspondent with the Food and Drug Administration, United States Department of Agriculture. In cooperation with this Federal Government agency, we present these reports once each week. The next one will be heard on _____, December _____, at _____ o'clock. This is Station _____.

######

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Radio Service
OFFICE OF INFORMATION

UNCLE SAM AT YOUR SERVICE Monday, December 23, 1935

(FOR BROADCAST USE ONLY)

Speaking Time: 10 minutes

ANNOUNCEMENT: Station _____ sends you now the regular weekly report from the Food and Drug Administration, United States Department of Agriculture.

--ooOoo--

Our report today concludes a series of eight in which your correspondent with the Food and Drug Administration at Washington has given us official explanations of the ways in which the present Federal Food and Drugs laws fall short of protecting the health and pocketbooks of consumers.

Your correspondent has exposed seven sorts of loopholes in the laws through which dangers to health and economic cheats may pass unmolested to menace the consumer of foods and drugs. Today, in his report he uncovers the eighth loophole. Now let me quote to you verbatim from his report:

"The eighth loophole in the present Federal Food and Drugs laws is that they do not confer upon Federal authorities any power to control interstate traffic in cosmetics, that may be harmful to the persons who use them. Some preparations sold in the past and at present as 'beautifiers' actually may destroy both beauty and health.

"Hair dyes, hair tonics, and hair removers dangerous to health have been sold and are being sold. The classic example of a dangerous hair remover, the sale of which could not be stopped by Federal officers, was a preparation known as 'Koremlu.' Advertisements for this hair removing preparation stated that it was harmless and beneficial to the skin. Actually, the product contained over

7 percent of thallium acetate, a deadly poison commonly used to kill rats. The amount of it contained in Koremlu was large enough to cause baldness, skin injury, nervous troubles, and glandular disturbances among the persons who, deluded by the advertising, used the preparation.

"Naturally some of the persons injured by the preparation, upon finding out from physicians what had caused the damage to their health, filed suit to recover damages under the civil laws. So many of these suits accumulated against the manufacturer that he was forced into bankruptcy. But that was small comfort to the persons who suffered great physical harm from using the preparation. There is no Federal law under which the sale of another such dangerous preparation could be stopped, for the Food and Drugs Act confers no jurisdiction over cosmetics.

"Here is another instance of a dangerous cosmetic still being sold, with Federal authorities powerless to prevent interstate traffic in it. The name of the product is Lash Lure. It is sold as an eyelash dye. It has been proved responsible for one death and numerous cases of injury, several of them being cases of total or partial blindness. The Federal Food and Drugs Act confers no authorization to deal with interstate traffic in cosmetics, so this dangerous preparation cannot be haled into court.

"It is fruitless to go ahead with detailed examples. Let me point out however, a few general facts. One is that hair dyes, hair tonics, and scalp tonics sometimes contain lead acetate. In the absence of legal control, buyers have no way of knowing whether they are getting a dose of lead acetate when they purchase and use such products. Thus they may without knowing it absorb lead slowly into their systems until they reach a state of chronic poisoning.

"Arsenic is an ingredient of some hair tonics recommended for dandruff. Like lead, arsenic may be absorbed slowly into the system from repeated small doses until finally chronic poisoning results.

"Some cosmetics contain mercury. Among them are hair tonics, ointments, freckle removers, 'beauty lotions', whitening creams. Prolonged exposure to mercury may cause systemic poisoning, since the skin absorbs this substance too. Some persons are highly susceptible to the poisonous effects of mercury.

"To sum up the present situation with respect to the loopholes in Federal Food and Drug legislation through which harmful cosmetics may move unmolested into interstate commerce, I would say this:

"Most cosmetics are harmless. But in the absence of legal control, the consumer has no way of knowing what they contain, whether they are honestly sold, whether they may be used with safety." (End of the quotation.)

Well, that concludes your official correspondent's exposure of the eighth loophole in the present Federal Food and Drugs laws. Now let's line up all eight loopholes, and take a peep through each. Your correspondent obligingly has sent us a few remarks on each one so that you listeners may refresh your memories as to how you are not protected in health and pocketbook by Federal law controlling traffic in food and drugs. Now I quote him again:

"Loophole number one in the existing laws is that Food and Drug enforcement officers, to convict dispensers of quack medicines that menace health of consumers either by causing them to delay rational medical treatment or through actively harmful ingredients -- to convict such gentry, the food and drug law enforcement officers must prove in each case that the defendant knew his medicine was fraudulent. Through this loophole many makers of nostrums have slipped by claiming that they were ignorant of the fact that they were perpetrating a fraud.

"Loophole number two: The standards of truthful statement on the labels of foods and drugs, including claims for curative values of the latter, apply only to labels. There are no similar standards set by law for statements in advertising matter not transmitted with the package of food or drugs.

"Loophole number three: The present laws do not require that the labels on drug preparations declare the presence of a number of dangerous drugs developed since the original Food and Drugs Act was passed. Example: Amidopyrine (ah-meedo-py-reen), present in many pain-killing preparations, but deadly to susceptible individuals. The law does not require the presence of amidopyrine to be declared on the label, so that the persons susceptible to it, and thus in grave peril if they use it, may know that they face danger when they take it.

"Loophole number four: The present law confers no authority upon the Federal Government to control either the labeling or the advertising claims of the fake devices and contraptions made for the sole purpose of defrauding the unwary victims of almost every disease or deformity known to man.

"Loophole number five: Except for butter, Federal law does not establish definitely and finally standards for the composition of foods. How this hampers efforts to protect consumers against economic fraud perpetrated by adulteration of foods was illustrated by the story of the action brought against the oyster company which was selling excessive water at oyster prices, but which was held beyond reach of law by a judge who condemned the company's practice, but dismissed the case against it because there was no legal standard limiting the amount of water that oysters may contain.

"Loophole number six: The 'distinctive name' joker. That is to say, the clause in the Food and Drugs Act which exempts from all provisions that otherwise apply to deceptive products, the products which are sold under fanciful names. By taking advantage of the 'distinctive name' clause in the present laws, unscrupulous manufacturers can avoid all risk in marketing products which are downright deceptive.

"Loophole number seven: The clause in the law which the courts have held to prohibit the addition of poisons to foods only when they are added in quantities harmful to health. And that has turned out to mean, practically, that the Government experts must convince juries that the amounts of poisons added are harmful to health in the quantities in which they occur in a specific sample, regardless of the danger of chronic poisoning developing in a person who over a period of weeks or months takes very minute amounts of a poison, not enough to harm at any one time.

"Loophole number eight: The one we have been talking about today -- the absence of legal control over cosmetics moving in interstate commerce." (End of quotation.)

That's all of the summary statement on loopholes in the present Federal Food and Drugs laws. Your correspondent with the Food and Drugs Administration asks me to leave this final thought with you:

"It's too bad at this season when the spirit of Peace on Earth, Good Will to Men, is stirring about us to be obliged to call attention to some of the less lovely things about foods and drugs. However, let me remind you that the great majority of the people in these trades are honest.

"I plan to resume sending reports to you, starting next week, on the positive side of Food and Drug law enforcement -- the active protection it affords you against health menaces and economic frauds, and how you may make fullest use of that protection.

"Meantime, I wish you the happiest of holiday seasons."

--ooOoo--

ANNOUNCEMENT: And Station _____ joins with the Federal Food and Drug Administration in yuletide wishes to the audience for this weekly report which we present in cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture.

#####

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Radio Service
OFFICE OF INFORMATION

1.9
In 3 Ue

UNCLE SAM AT YOUR SERVICE Monday, December 30, 1935

(FOR BROADCAST USE ONLY)

Speaking Time: 10 minutes

ANNOUNCEMENT: Monday it is again, and _____ o'clock -- the time for your report from the Federal Food and Drug Administration. We send you this each week at this hour to inform you concerning the enforcement of the Federal Food and Drugs Act, and how each one of you listeners as a consumer may derive benefit from understanding the Act and its requirements with respect to the labeling of foods and drugs. In sending you these reports we cooperate with the United States Department of Agriculture.

--ooOoo--

For the past few weeks in these reports the Food and Drug officers of the Federal Government have been calling to your attention the ways in which consumers of foods and drugs are not protected by existing legislation. They have been pointing out to you the loopholes in the law through which products, dangerous to health, or likely to trick the buyer into paying more than they are intrinsically worth, may slip into the channels of trade. They have been sending us these reports on the theory that the consumer should know where the protection given him by the enforcement of food and drugs legislation ends.

Having completed this series of reports, they start today on another series which again brings to your attention the positive side of Food and Drug law enforcement -- the actual protection afforded consumers. And as the first one of this new series, fittingly enough at the close of the old year, they send you a summary of the annual report of W. G. Campbell, chief of the Food

and Drug Administration, summing up the enforcement work under the Food and Drugs Act during the year ended June 30, 1935.

Seizure of poisonous, decomposed or filthy foods is like stopping a murderer's bullet in flight. In his annual report Mr. Campbell quotes this sharp sentence from an "informed commentator."

He continues, saying seizure has been criticised as only a worthless gesture that may be compared to the arrest of a murderer's revolver after it has slain its victim. Mr. Campbell does not agree. He says it is better to protect the public health by seizing and destroying dangerous food and drugs before they can cause injury, than it is to prosecute after the damage is done. Seizure is the prompt and effective method which is the first reliance of the Food and Drug Administration.

Mr. Campbell reports that for the year under review, which ended June 30, 1935, there was a definite increase in the number of seizures and prosecutions. In the course of the year there were 2,011 seizures and 1,029 prosecutions, each of these figures running slightly ahead of the 1934 record. More than 60,000 samples were collected and examined, not by indiscriminate sampling, but as the result of carefully planned procedure which is applied in all inspection districts. Examinations of imported foods and drugs took about one-sixth of the time of the food and drug workers. At the same time and without relaxing activity in policing the food and drug channels, a program was initiated for training the additional personnel authorized by an increased appropriation for the enforcement of the Food and Drugs Act.

Two important divisions were created within the Administration in response to developments in the food and drug field. A unit was set up for assay of vitamin claims in food products and for research in vitamin testing and standardization. A new pharmacological unit will handle food and drug work connected with

biological products, glandular preparations, new synthetic chemicals and drugs, and will investigate a range of problems connected with insecticide residues on food products.

Another new departure was administration of the "sea-food amendment" which Congress adopted in 1934. Sponsored by the shrimp packers, this provided that packers of sea-food might apply for government inspection of their processes, the packer to bear the expense. It proved a popular service. To qualify for the inspection label, many of the packers found it necessary to modernize plant and equipment to insure more sanitary packing. Packers express satisfaction with the workings of the amendment; most of the canned shrimp is now packed under inspection and as a result there is little need for seizures or prosecutions.

The Food and Drug Administration continued to devote some attention to alcoholic beverages, including medicinal whiskies, but made only 16 seizures in the course of the year, leaving most of the work of supervision to the Federal Alcohol Control Administration.

As in previous years, the Food and Drug Administration classified food and drug violations into three principal groups and made a rough division of the time and effort to be devoted to each group of offenses. "The suppression of practices constituting menaces to public health requires first attention", says Mr. Campbell. "Next in importance are adulterations involving the contamination of foods with filth or by decomposition. Numerically, however, those violations which involve economic cheats are in the majority." As in previous years, it has not been possible to devote as much attention to the third class of offenses as might seem desirable because the need for enforcement of health and sanitary safeguards is obviously even more necessary.

Spray-residue inspections have been and will probably continue to be the most important single regulatory activity. This takes more time than any other single effort. For the fiscal year, conditions were relatively good on the West Coast and in the Atlantic Seaboard area, and the greatest number of seizures was in the Great Lakes and Mississippi Valley States. "State authorities," says Mr. Campbell, "are taking a more and more active interest in patrolling and regulating the output of their own States, and growers' groups are seriously addressing themselves to constructive programs of systematic spray control and cleansing." Citing examples of State activities both in the Far West and in the Atlantic States and West Virginia, he said, "such splendid cooperation deserves the strongest commendation," and cannot fail to result in far better public protection than is possible merely from Food and Drug Administration activity, which is restricted to interstate shipments.

Mr. Campbell also recorded the highly desirable activity of State officials in helping to clean up the cream supply. This was primarily an activity of the States in which the Federal workers cooperated helpfully.

There were investigations of 73 outbreaks of food poisoning, including 7 diagnosed as botulism, but, as in several previous years, there was no cause of botulism from domestic supplies of commercially canned foods. Another notable record was the fact that it was not necessary to seize a single can of the salmon pack for the year. One seizure in July 1934 was of salmon from the previous pack. The same happy situation with respect to canned salmon did not exist for the 1935 pack. It was put up under adverse conditions, and enforcement officers have been obliged to seize thousands of cases this past Fall. They have made the seizures, however, so the supply reaching the public is wholesome.

An unusual development of the past fiscal year reflected disturbed economic conditions. Unscrupulous drug dealers were more active than ever before in "salvage" and "distressed merchandise" transactions, and would take in trade and try to work off in sales old and deteriorated products. Seizures of this type of goods resulted in discoveries of products that have been on the shelves since before the Food and Drug Act was enacted. These unscrupulous brokers were particularly active in Texas, and the State authorities cooperating with the Food and Drug Administration seized and destroyed 28 tons of these dangerous old stocks.

In the early days of food and drug enforcement gross violations were easy to detect even without delicate tests. Now the few manufacturers who try to cheat are more adept, and the Administration is often forced to engage in intricate research in order to make sure of tests which will stand up in the courts. Perfection of tests for minute quantities of lead in foods has enabled the chemists to detect lead in imported sardines which comes from the solder used in sealing the can. They also find lead in tea that is marketed in lead foil. As a result canners and packers are forced to revise their methods and to pack foods safely.

The supervision of anaesthetics -- ether and chloroform -- continues, and the quality has been improved so greatly that few seizures were required.

The report includes a review of a number of the more important cases decided during the year. Fines ranged from one cent to as high as $4,500. The report also includes brief sections on the enforcement of the laws other than the Food and Drug Act for which the Food and Drug Administration is responsible. These include the Insecticide Act, the Caustic Poison Act, the Import Milk Act, the Naval Stores Act, and the certification of coal-tar colors. As usual the

Food and Drug Administration made many tests for the various purchasing agencies in other branches of the Government.

--ooOoo--

CLOSING ANNOUNCEMENT: And that brings us up to date on the work of Federal Food and Drug law enforcement. We will continue this series of Uncle Sam at Your Service reports during 1936, presenting them each _____ at _____ o'clock, in cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture.

######